

From: [Benjamin Shorr](#)
To: [Robert W. Gensemer](#)
Cc: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Margaret Spence](#); [Carrie A. Smith](#); [Brad Hermanson](#); [Jay Field](#)
Subject: Re: Revised Ecological PRGs for Mapping
Date: 04/21/2009 01:26 PM

Bob-

I'm happy to work with whomever is leading the presentation/discussion of benthic risk but I would certainly defer the leading of the discussion to whomever Eric would like. I have prepared empirical results that Jay has calculated based on the MacDonald and EPA guidance. These are reference envelope adjusted responses. I also have done analysis with the 2 predictive models (LRM and FPM) integrated on a spatial (gridded) cell basis that was used for Rd 3 data gaps analysis and was updated with most recent surface sediment data (Nov. 08). Carrie has bundled and just sent out this data for incorporation into the GIS project.

As for a modeled toxicity PRG contour- I'm not aware of any efforts towards this.

Thanks Bob-
Ben

Robert W. Gensemer wrote:

Eric: Thanks for the additional prioritizations--they look fine to me. I've also heard that Ben is leading the presentation of the benthic risk data, which will be an essential component to the eco-PRG discussion of course. Just a quick question for Ben: Are you planning on presenting empirical results, model predictions or both? I'm primarily interested in the empirical results overlayed onto the various PRGs (as points), but if the models in their current state can generate some kind of toxicity PRG that can be contoured like the others, that would be valuable to look at as well.

Next up, I plan to start digging into some of these queries myself using the GIS tool (assuming I can still figure out how to use it...) to start trying to get an advance look at the outcomes, and start figuring out how to summarize the results. Speaking of which, now that the mapping tasks are queued up, we (perhaps you, Burt, and I) need to discuss how you want us to present and discuss the eco-PRGs at the retreat, who leads the presentation(s), and so on. In the meantime, I'll start familiarizing myself with the tool and possible outcomes.

-Bob

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov [<mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2009 11:07 AM
To: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; Benjamin Shorr; anderson.jim@deq.state.or.us; frenchrd@cdm.com; Carrie A. Smith; jpeers@stratusconsulting.com; Locke, Adam; Gubitosa.Matt@epamail.epa.gov; McCarthy.Sue@epamail.epa.gov; Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov; JETT.Steven@deq.state.or.us; duminiakMH@cdm.com; Margaret Spence
Cc: Robert W. Gensemer; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Revised Ecological PRGs for Mapping

Attached is a spreadsheet summarizing the ecological PRGs for mapping. The PRGs highlighted in rose are the highest priority. The PRGs highlighted in maroon are the next priority. The PRGs highlighted in green are those PRGs for which the data must be incorporated into the tool. These should be done if there is time and the data can be easily added to the tool. The chemicals highlighted in darker green are a higher priority.

I have clarified the hill topping scale in the column on the far right. Regarding the benthic risk, ideally, we would be able to map these on RM, each side basis. However, in the interest in expediency, I have noted that these should be mapped on a RM, both sides basis recognizing that we are really assessing risk on a point by point basis.

Let me know if you have any questions. Our next scheduled check-in is this Friday at 9:00 am. Use the TCT call-in number.

Thanks for all your work on this.

Eric

--

Benjamin Shorr | Physical Scientist
NOAA National Ocean Service
Office of Response & Restoration
Assessment & Restoration Division
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115

benjamin.shorr@noaa.gov

(v) 206.526.4654 (f) 206.526.6865

http://response.restoration.noaa.gov/orr_about.php